arXiv:1502.05594v1 [math.AP] 19 Feb 2015

NEUMANN PROBLEM FOR NON-DIVERGENCE ELLIPTIC AND PARABOLIC EQUATIONS WITH BMO$_x$ COEFFICIENTS IN WEIGHTED SOBOLEV SPACES

HONGJIE DONG, DOYOON KIM, AND HONG ZHANG

Abstract. We prove the unique solvability in weighted Sobolev spaces of non-divergence form elliptic and parabolic equations on a half space with the homogeneous Neumann boundary condition. All the leading coefficients are assumed to be only measurable in the time variable and have small mean oscillations in the spatial variables. Our results can be applied to Neumann boundary value problems for *stochastic* partial differential equations with BMO$_x$ coefficients.

1. Introduction

In this paper, we study L_p estimates for elliptic and parabolic equations in non-divergence form:

$$a_{ij}D_{ij}u + b_iD_iu + cu - \lambda u = f \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d_+,$$

$$-u_t + a_{ij}D_{ij}u + b_iD_iu + cu - \lambda u = f \quad \text{in } (-\infty, T)\times\mathbb{R}^d_+,$$

with the homogeneous Neumann boundary condition, where λ is a nonnegative constant and $\mathbb{R}^d_+$ is a half space defined by

$$\mathbb{R}^d_+ = \{x = (x_1, \cdots, x_d) = (x_1, x') : x_1 > 0\}.$$

We consider the equations in weighted Sobolev spaces with measures

$$\mu_d(dx) = x_1^{\theta-d}\,dx \quad \text{and} \quad \mu(dx\,dt) = x_1^{\theta-d}\,dx\,dt$$

in the elliptic and parabolic cases, respectively, for some $\theta \in (d-1, d-1+p)$.

Krylov [17] first studied Laplace's equation and the heat equation in weighted Sobolev spaces $H^\gamma_{p,\theta}$ and $\mathbb{H}^\gamma_{p,\theta}$; see Section 2 for precise definitions. After [17], there has been quite a few work on the solvability theory for elliptic and parabolic equations in weighted Sobolev spaces, for instance, see [12, 15, 13, 10]. In particular, the authors of [13, 10] studied second-order parabolic equations with the Dirichlet boundary condition in weighted Sobolev spaces with leading coefficients having small mean oscillations. The motivation of such theory came from stochastic partial differential equations (SPDEs) and is well explained in [16].

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 35J25, 35K20, 35R05.

Key words and phrases. L_p estimates, weighted Sobolev spaces, parabolic equations.

H. Dong was partially supported by the NSF under agreement DMS-1056737.

H. Zhang was partially supported by the NSF under agreement DMS-1056737.

Recently, Dong and Kim [4] studied both divergence and non-divergence type elliptic and parabolic equations on a half space in weighted Sobolev spaces with the Dirichlet boundary condition. The coefficients in [4] are contained in a larger class than those in [13, 10]. Namely, the leading coefficients are assumed to be only measurable in t and x_1 except a_{11}, which is measurable in either t or x_1, where x_1 is the normal direction. Kozlov and Nazarov [14] considered an oblique derivative problem for non-divergence type parabolic equations on a half space with coefficients discontinuous in t (and continuous in x) in a weighted Sobolev space. Their proof is based on a careful investigation of Green's functions. In this paper, we extend the result in [14] to a more general setting. Namely, the coefficients considered in this paper are measurable in the time variable and have small mean oscillations with respect to a weighted measure in the spatial variables. We call this class of coefficients BMO_x. The weight, for instance, for the parabolic case is $\mu(dx\,dt) = x_1^{\theta-d}\,dx\,dt$, where $\theta \in (d-1, d-1+p)$. The condition $\theta \in (d-1, d-1+p)$ is sharp even for the heat equation; see [17]. We note that the coefficients a_{ij} in [4] also have small mean oscillations with respect to a weighted measure as functions of $x' \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$ (whereas, in this paper as functions of $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$), but the size of the modulus of regularity of a^{ij} is proportional to the distance to the boundary. See Assumption 2.1 and Remark 2.2.

Since the counterexamples of Ural'ceva [26] and Nadirashvili [25], particular types of discontinuous coefficients have been considered for the solvability of equations. One type of discontinuous coefficients, which has been widely considered, is the class of vanishing mean oscillation (VMO) coefficients. The study of equations with VMO coefficients was initiated by Chiarenza, Frasca, and Longo [1, 2]. In [18] Krylov gave a unified approach to investigating parabolic and elliptic equations in unweighted Sobolev spaces with coefficients that are measurable in the time variable and have small mean oscillations with respect to the usual Lebesgue measure in the spatial variables (BMO_x with respect to the Lebesgue measure); see also [19]. In fact, the coefficients in [18] are called VMO_x coefficients, but their mean oscillations in x do not have to vanish as the radii of cylinders go to zero. For more related work about L_p theory with BMO_x or partially BMO_x coefficients for parabolic systems and higher-order parabolic systems, we refer the reader to [7, 8, 6, 5] and the references therein.

Our proof is in the spirit of the approach by Krylov [18]. The key point of such approach is to establish mean oscillation type estimates for equations with simple coefficients, i.e., coefficients are only measurable as functions of t. Then we apply a perturbation argument, which is well suited to the mean oscillation estimates, to deal with BMO_x coefficients. Finally we obtain the desired L_p estimates by applying the Fefferman–Stein theorem on sharp functions and the Hardy–Littlewood maximal function theorem in weighted L_p spaces.

Here one of the main steps is to get the mean oscillation estimates of D^2u. For a simple equation

$$-u_t + a_{ij}(t)D_{ij}u = f$$

in $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d_+$ with the Neumann boundary condition $D_1u = 0$ on $\{x_1 = 0\}$, we treat DD_1u and $D^2_{x'}u$ separately. We estimate DD_1u as follows. Differentiating the equation above with respect to x_1, it is easily seen that D_1u satisfies the divergence type parabolic equation

$$-(D_1u)_t + D_i(a_{ij}D_j(D_1u)) = D_1f$$

in $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d_+$ with $D_1u = 0$ on $\{x_1 = 0\}$. Therefore, we can apply a result in [4] to obtain the mean oscillation estimates of DD_1u. On the other hand, the estimates of $D^2_{x'}u$ are much involved. We treat the mean oscillations of $D^2_{x'}u$ in the x_1 variable and x' variables differently. By integrating by parts and the Poincaré inequality in weighted spaces, we manage to bound the mean oscillations of $D^2_{x'}u$ in the x_1 variable by the maximal functions of DD_1u. For the mean oscillations in x' variables, we write the equation in the following form

$$-u_t + \sum_{i,j\geq 2} a_{ij}D_{ij}u = f - \sum_{j=2}^{d}(a_{j1} + a_{1j})D_{1j}u - a_{11}D_{11}u,$$

which can be regarded as a non-divergence type parabolic equation in $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$. Then by applying an interior estimate result without weights for D^2u, where u is, as a function of $x' \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$, a solution of a non-divergence type equation in the whole space $\mathbb{R}^{d-1}$ (see, for instance, [18]), we bound the mean oscillations of $D^2_{x'}u$ in the x' variables by the maximal functions of f, DD_1u and $D^2_{x'}u$.

As an application of our results, in a forthcoming paper we are going to study non-divergence form SPDEs in weighted or unweighted Sobolev spaces with the Neumann boundary condition. A particular case is the solvability of SPDEs in the form

$$du = (a_{ij}D_{ij}u + b_iD_iu + cu - \lambda u + f)\,dt + g_k\,dw^k_t \quad \text{in } (-\infty, T) \times \mathbb{R}^d_+,$$

where w^k_t are independent one-dimensional Wiener processes, a_{ij}, b_i, and c satisfy the same conditions as in the current paper, and f, Dg_k, $g_k \in \mathbb{L}_{p,\theta}(-\infty, T)$; see the definition of the $\mathbb{L}_{p,\theta}$ space at the beginning of Section 2. We note that SPDEs in weighted Sobolev spaces with the *Dirichlet boundary condition* have been studied extensively in the past fifteen years. We refer the reader to [22, 21, 20, 11] and the references therein.

This paper is organized as follows. In the next section, we introduce some notation and state our main results. In Section 3, we obtain the mean oscillation estimates for $D^2_{x'}u$ and DD_1u separately for a parabolic equation with simple coefficients. In Section 4, we prove our main theorem (Theorem 2.3).

2. PRELIMINARIES AND MAIN RESULTS

Throughout the paper we use, for example, the following Einstein summation convention: $a_{ij}D_{ij}u = \sum_{i,j} a_{ij}D_{ij}u$. We introduce some notation used in the paper. As hinted in the introduction, a point in $\mathbb{R}^d$ is denoted by $x = (x_1, \cdots, x_d)$, and also by $x = (x_1, x')$, where $x' \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$. Recall $\mathbb{R}^d_+ = \{x : x_1 > 0\}$. In the parabolic case a point in $\mathbb{R}^{d+1} = \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d$ is denoted by $X = (t, x)$. Set $\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_+ = \{(t, x) : x_1 > 0\}$. For $r > 0$, let $B'_r(x')$ be the open ball in $\mathbb{R}^{d-1}$ of radius r with center x'. Denote

$$
\begin{aligned}
&B_r(x) = B_r(x_1, x') = (x_1 - r, x_1 + r) \times B'_r(x'),\\
&Q_r(t, x) = (t - r^2, t) \times B_r(x),\\
&B^+_r(x) = B_r(x) \cap \mathbb{R}^d_+, \quad Q^+_r(t, x) = Q_r(t, x) \cap \mathbb{R}^{d+1}_+.
\end{aligned}
$$

For $a \in \mathbb{R}$, we use $Q_r(a)$ to denote

$$
Q_r(0, a, 0) = (-r^2, 0) \times (a - r, a + r) \times B'_r(0),
$$

and $Q_r = Q_r(0)$. Similarly, we define $Q^+_r(a)$ and Q^+_r. By a^+ we mean $\max\{a, 0\}$.

Throughout the paper, we assume that the leading coefficients a_{ij} are bounded, measurable, and satisfy the ellipticity condition:

$$
a_{ij}\eta_i\eta_j \geq \delta|\eta|^2, \quad |a_{ij}| \leq 1/\delta
$$

for any $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^d$, where $\delta > 0$ is a constant.

To introduce the function spaces used in this paper, we first recall the weighted Sobolev spaces $H^\gamma_{p,\theta}$ introduced in [17]. If γ is a non-negative integer

$$
H^\gamma_{p,\theta} = H^\gamma_{p,\theta}(\mathbb{R}^d_+) = \{u : x_1^{|\alpha|}D^\alpha u \in L_{p,\theta}(\mathbb{R}^d_+) \quad \forall\, \alpha : 0 \leq |\alpha| \leq \gamma\},
$$

where $L_{p,\theta}(\mathbb{R}^d_+)(= L_{p,\theta})$ is a Lebesgue space with the measure $\mu_d(dx) = x_1^{\theta-d}\,dx$. For a general real number γ, $H^\gamma_{p,\theta}$ is defined as follows. Take and fix a nonnegative function $\zeta \in C^\infty_0(0, \infty)$ such that

$$
\sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} \zeta^p(e^{x_1 - n}) \geq 1
$$

for all $x_1 \in \mathbb{R}$. For any $\gamma, \theta \in \mathbb{R}$ and $p \in (1, \infty)$, let $H^\gamma_{p,\theta}$ be the set of all functions u on $\mathbb{R}^d_+$ such that

$$
\|u\|^p_{\gamma,p,\theta} = \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} e^{n\theta}\|u(e^n\cdot)\zeta(x_1)\|^p_{\gamma,p} < \infty,
$$

where $\|\cdot\|_{\gamma,p}$ is the norm in the Bessel potential space $H^\gamma_p(\mathbb{R}^d)$. For any $a \in \mathbb{R}$, let M^α be the operator of multiplication by $(x_1)^\alpha$ and $M := M^1$. We write $u \in M^\alpha H^\gamma_{p.\theta}$ if $M^{-\alpha}u \in H^\gamma_{p,\theta}$. We set

$$
\mathbb{H}^\gamma_{p,\theta}(S, T) = L_p((S, T), H^\gamma_{p,\theta}), \quad \mathbb{L}_{p,\theta}(S, T) = L_p((S, T), L_{p,\theta}),
$$

where $-\infty \le S < T \le \infty$.

Our solution spaces are defined as follows. For the elliptic case, we set

$$W^2_{p,\theta}(\mathbb{R}^d_+) = \{u : u, Du, D^2u \in L_{p,\theta}(\mathbb{R}^d_+)\}.$$

For the parabolic case,

$$W^{1,2}_{p,\theta}(S,T) = \{u : u, Du, D^2u, u_t \in \mathbb{L}_{p,\theta}(S,T)\},$$

where $-\infty \le S < T \le \infty$.

We also use the following Hölder spaces. For a function f on $\mathcal{D} \subset \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$, define

$$[f]_{a,b,\mathcal{D}} =: \sup\Big\{\frac{|f(t,x) - f(s,y)|}{|t-s|^a + |x-y|^b} : (t,x),(s,y) \in \mathcal{D}, (t,x) \neq (s,y)\Big\},$$

where $a, b \in (0,1]$. For $a \in (0,1]$, we set

$$\|f\|_{\frac{a}{2},a,\mathcal{D}} = \|f\|_{\infty,D} + [f]_{\frac{a}{2},a.\mathcal{D}}.$$

The space corresponding to $\|\cdot\|_{a/2,a,\mathcal{D}}$ is denoted by $C^{a/2,a}(\mathcal{D})$.

Throughout the paper, we use the weighted measures:

$$\mu_d(dx) := (x_1)^{\theta-d}\,dx, \quad \mu(dx\,dt) := (x_1)^{\theta-d}\,dx\,dt,$$

where $\theta \in (d-1, d-1+p)$ and $p \in (1,\infty)$.

Now we state our regularity assumption on the leading coefficients. For a function g on $\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_+$, denote

$$[g(t,\cdot)]_{B^+_r(x)} = \fint_{B^+_r(x)} |g(t,y) - \fint_{B^+_r(x)} g(t,z)\,\mu_d(dz)|\,\mu_d(dy).$$

Then we define the mean oscillation of g in $Q^+_r(s,y)$ with respect to x as

$$\operatorname{osc}_x(g, Q^+_r(s,y)) = \fint_{s-r^2}^{s} [g(\tau,\cdot)]_{B^+_r(y)} d\tau,$$

and denote

$$g^{\#}_R = \sup_{(s,y)\in\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_+} \sup_{r\le R} \operatorname{osc}_x(g, Q^+_r(s,y)). \tag{2.1}$$

Using the notation above with a_{ij} in place of g, we state the following regularity assumption on a_{ij} with a sufficiently small parameter $\rho > 0$ to be specified later.

Assumption 2.1 (ρ)**.** There exists a positive constant R_0 such that

$$A^{\#}_{R_0} := \sup_{i,j} (a_{ij})^{\#}_{R_0} \le \rho.$$

Note that under this assumption, the coefficients a^{ij} may not have any regularity with respect to t.

Remark 2.2. While we have a fixed size of the modulus of regularity R_0 above, in [4] the size of the modulus is proportional to the distance from the boundary to the location where the mean oscillations of a_{ij} are measured. To express this, one can replace R in (2.1) by $y_1 R$. This means, in particular, that the coefficients a_{ij} in [4] are allowed to be much rougher *near the boundary* than those in this paper.

For lower-order terms, we assume that the coefficients b_i and c are only measurable (without any regularity assumptions) and bounded so that

$$|b_i|,\ |c| \leq K$$

for some constant $K > 0$.

The following theorems are our main results, the first of which is the unique solvability of parabolic equations.

Theorem 2.3. *Let $T \in (-\infty, \infty]$, $1 < p < \infty$, and $\theta \in (d-1, d-1+p)$ be constants. Then there exist constants $\rho = \rho(d, \delta, p, \theta) > 0$ and $\lambda_0 = \lambda_0(d, \delta, p, \theta, K, R_0) \geq 0$ such that under Assumption 2.1 (ρ) the following assertions hold.*

(i) Suppose that $u \in W^{1,2}_{p,\theta}(-\infty, T)$ satisfies

$$-u_t + a_{ij} D_{ij} u + b_i D_i u + cu - \lambda u = f \tag{2.2}$$

in $(-\infty, T) \times \mathbb{R}^d_+$ with the Neumann boundary condition $D_1 u = 0$ on $\{x_1 = 0\}$, where $f \in \mathbb{L}_{p,\theta}(-\infty, T)$. Then we have

$$\|u_t\|_{p,\theta} + \|M^{-1} D_1 u\|_{p,\theta} + \|D^2 u\|_{p,\theta} + \sqrt{\lambda} \|Du\|_{p,\theta} + \lambda \|u\|_{p,\theta} \leq C_0 \|f\|_{p,\theta} \tag{2.3}$$

provided that $\lambda \geq \lambda_0$, where $\|\cdot\|_{p,\theta} = \|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{L}_{p,\theta}(-\infty,T)}$ and $C_0 = C_0(d, \delta, p, \theta)$. In particular, when $b_i = c = 0$ and $a_{ij} = a_{ij}(t)$, we can take $\lambda_0 = 0$.

(ii) For any $\lambda > \lambda_0$ and $f \in \mathbb{L}_{p,\theta}(-\infty, T)$, there is a unique solution $u \in W^{1,2}_{p,\theta}(-\infty, T)$ to the equation (2.2).

We now present our results for elliptic equations, where the coefficients are independent of t. Since Assumption 2.1 (ρ) does not concern the regularity of coefficients in t, we still require the coefficients to satisfy Assumption 2.1 (ρ).

By adapting, for example, the proof of [18, Theorem 2.6] to the results above for parabolic equations, i.e., by regarding elliptic equations as steady state parabolic equations, we obtain the following theorem for elliptic equations.

Theorem 2.4. *Let $1 < p < \infty$ and $\theta \in (d-1, d-1+p)$ be constants. Then there exist constants $\rho = \rho(d, \delta, p, \theta) > 0$ and $\lambda_0 = \lambda_0(d, \delta, p, \theta, K, R_0) \geq 0$ such that under Assumption 2.1 (ρ) the following assertions hold.*

(i) Suppose that $u \in W^2_{p,\theta}(\mathbb{R}^d_+)$ satisfies

$$a_{ij} D_{ij} u + b_i D_i u + cu - \lambda u = f \tag{2.4}$$

in $\mathbb{R}^d_+$ *with the Neumann boundary condition* $D_1u = 0$ *on* $\{x_1 = 0\}$*, where* $f \in L_{p,\theta}(\mathbb{R}^d_+)$*. Then we have*

$$\|M^{-1}D_1u\|_{p,\theta} + \|D^2u\|_{p,\theta} + \sqrt{\lambda}\|Du\|_{p,\theta} + \lambda\|u\|_{p,\theta} \le C_0\|f\|_{p,\theta}$$

provided that $\lambda \ge \lambda_0$*, where* $\|\cdot\|_{p,\theta} = \|\cdot\|_{L_{p,\theta}(\mathbb{R}^d_+)}$ *and* $C_0 = C_0(d, \delta, p, \theta)$*. In particular, when* $b_i = c = 0$ *and* a_{ij} *are constant, we can take* $\lambda_0 = 0$*.*

(ii) For any $\lambda > \lambda_0$ *and* $f \in L_{p,\theta}(\mathbb{R}^d_+)$*, there is a unique solution* $u \in W^2_{p,\theta}(\mathbb{R}^d_+)$ *to the equation* (2.4)*.*

3. Equations with coefficients independent of x

In this section, we deal with equations in the form

$$u_t - a_{ij}(t)D_{ij}u = f \quad \text{in} \quad \mathbb{R}^{d+1}_+, \tag{3.1}$$

$$D_1u = 0 \quad \text{on} \quad \{x_1 = 0\}. \tag{3.2}$$

Note that now the coefficients a_{ij} depend only on t. Let us state several technical lemmas. The first one is Hardy's inequality, which can be found in [24].

Lemma 3.1. *Let* $p \in (1, \infty)$*,* $\theta \in (d-1, d-1+p)$*, and* $v \in C^\infty_{loc}(\overline{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_+})$ *such that* $v = 0$ *on* $\{x_1 = 0\}$*. Then*

$$\int_{B_r^+} |v|^p y_1^{\theta-d-p}\,dy \le C\int_{B_r^+} |D_1v|^p y_1^{\theta-d}\,dy$$

for any $r \in (0, \infty]$*, where* $C = C(d, p, \theta)$*.*

We summarize Lemmas 4.2 and 4.3 in [4] as the following results, which were proved by localizing the results in [9, 3] and using the Sobolev embedding theorem.

Lemma 3.2. *Let* $p \in (1, \infty)$ *and* $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ *be constants. Assume that* $u \in C^\infty_{loc}(\overline{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_+})$ *satisfies* (3.1) *in* Q_2^+ *with* $f = 0$*, and* $u = 0$ *on* $\{x_1 = 0\}$*. Then we have*

$$\|Du\|_{C^{\alpha/2,\alpha}(Q_1^+)} \le C\|u\|_{L_p(Q_2^+)},$$

where $C = C(d, \delta, p, \alpha)$*. If* Q_1 *and* Q_2 *replace* Q_1^+ *and* Q_2^+*, respectively, then*

$$\|Du\|_{C^{\alpha/2,\alpha}(Q_1)} \le C\|Du\|_{L_p(Q_2)}.$$

For a domain $\mathcal{D} \subset \mathbb{R}^{d+1}_+$, we denote $(u)_\mathcal{D}$ to be the average of u in $\mathcal{D}$ with respect to the measure $\mu(dx\,dt) = x_1^{\theta-d}\,dx\,dt$. Precisely,

$$(u)_\mathcal{D} = \frac{1}{\mu(\mathcal{D})}\int_\mathcal{D} u(t,x)\mu(dx\,dt) = \fint_\mathcal{D} u(t,x)\mu(dx\,dt),$$

where

$$\mu(\mathcal{D}) = \int_\mathcal{D} \mu(dx\,dt).$$

Using Lemma 3.2, we obtain the following mean oscillation type estimate.

Corollary 3.3. *Let $p \in (1,\infty)$, $\alpha \in (0,1)$, $y_1 \in [0,1]$, and $\theta \in (d-1, d-1+p)$ be constants. Assume that $u \in C^\infty_{loc}(\overline{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_+})$ satisfies*

$$u_t - a_{ij}(t)D_{ij}u = 0 \quad in \quad Q_4^+$$

with the Dirichlet boundary condition $u = 0$ on $\{x_1 = 0\}$. Then there exists a constant $C = C(d, \delta, p, \theta, \alpha)$ such that for any $r < 1$,

$$(|Du - (Du)_{Q_r^+(y_1)}|^p)_{Q_r^+(y_1)} \le Cr^{\alpha p} \int_{Q_4^+} |D_1 u|^p \, \mu(dx\, dt).$$

Proof. From Lemma 3.2, we obtain

$$(|Du - (Du)_{Q_r^+(y_1)}|^p)_{Q_r^+(y_1)} \le r^{\alpha p}[Du]^p_{\frac{\alpha}{2},\alpha,Q_2^+} \le Cr^{\alpha p}\|u\|^p_{L_p(Q_4^+)}.$$

Since $\theta - d - p < 0$ and by Lemma 3.1, we have

$$\|u\|^p_{L_p(Q_4^+)} \le C \int_{Q_4^+} |u|^p x_1^{\theta-d-p}\, dx\, dt \le C \int_{Q_4^+} |D_1 u|^p \, \mu(dx\, dt).$$

Combining the two inequalities above, we prove the corollary. □

Before we state the next theorem, we introduce a function space. For $\lambda \ge 0$, we denote $u \in \mathcal{H}^{1,\lambda}_{p,\theta}(-\infty, T)$ if

$$\sqrt{\lambda}u,\ M^{-1}u,\ Du \in \mathbb{L}_{p,\theta}(-\infty, T),$$

and $u_t \in M^{-1}\mathbb{H}^{-1}_{p,\theta}(-\infty, T) + \sqrt{\lambda}\mathbb{L}_{p,\theta}(-\infty, T)$. Let us write $\mathcal{H}^1_{p,\theta}(-\infty, T)$ if $\lambda = 0$. By [17, Remark 5.3], one can find $f, g = (g_1, \dots, g_d) \in \mathbb{L}_{p,\theta}(-\infty, T)$ such that

$$u_t = D_i g_i + \sqrt{\lambda} f$$

in $(-\infty, T) \times \mathbb{R}^d_+$. We set

$$\|u\|_{\mathcal{H}^{1,\lambda}_{p,\theta}(-\infty,T)} = \inf\Big\{ \sqrt{\lambda}\|u\|_{p,\theta} + \|M^{-1}u\|_{p,\theta} + \|Du\|_{p,\theta} + \|g\|_{p,\theta} + \|f\|_{p,\theta} : u_t = D_i g_i + \sqrt{\lambda} f \Big\}.$$

Now we state a special case ($a^{ij} = a^{ij}(t)$) of [4, Theorem 3.9], where a^{ij} are allowed to be merely measurable in (t, x_1) except that $a^{11} = a^{11}(t)$ or $a^{11} = a^{11}(x_1)$. Note that in the theorem below there is no specification of the boundary condition, but functions in the solution space $\mathcal{H}^{1,\lambda}_{p,\theta}(-\infty, T)$ necessarily satisfies $u = 0$ on the boundary. Hence the theorem is about the Dirichlet boundary value problem for divergence type equations in weighted Sobolev spaces.

Theorem 3.4. *Let $T \in (-\infty, \infty]$, $\lambda \ge 0$, $p \in (1,\infty)$, $\theta \in (d-1, d-1+p)$, and $u \in \mathcal{H}^{1,\lambda}_{p,\theta}(-\infty, T)$ satisfy*

$$u_t - D_i(a_{ij}D_j u) + \lambda u = D_i g_i + f \tag{3.3}$$

in $(-\infty,T)\times\mathbb{R}^d_+$, *where* $g=(g_1,g_2,\dots,g_d)$, $g,f\in\mathbb{L}_{p,\theta}(-\infty,T)$, *and* $f\equiv 0$ *if* $\lambda=0$. *Then we have*

$$\sqrt{\lambda}\|u\|_{p,\theta}+\|M^{-1}u\|_{p,\theta}+\|Du\|_{p,\theta}\le C\|g\|_{p,\theta}+\frac{C}{\sqrt{\lambda}}\|f\|_{p,\theta},$$

where $C=C(d,\delta,p,\theta)$. *Moreover, for any* $g,f\in\mathbb{L}_{p,\theta}(-\infty,T)$ *such that* $f\equiv 0$ *if* $\lambda=0$, *there exists a unique solution* $u\in\mathcal{H}^{1,\lambda}_{p,\theta}(-\infty,T)$ *to the equation* (3.3).

Next we consider (3.1)-(3.2) with non-vanishing right-hand side.

Lemma 3.5. *Let* $p\in(1,\infty)$, $\theta\in(d-1,d-1+p)$, $\alpha\in(0,1)$, $r>0,\kappa\ge 32$, *and* $y_1\ge 0$. *Assume that* $f\in\mathbb{L}_{p,\theta}(Q^+_{\kappa r}(y_1))$ *and* $u\in C^\infty_{loc}(\overline{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_+})$ *is a solution of*

$$u_t-a_{ij}D_{ij}u=f$$

in $Q^+_{\kappa r}(y_1)$ *with the Neumann boundary condition* $D_1u=0$ *on* $\{x_1=0\}$. *Then we have*

$$\begin{aligned}&(|DD_1u-(DD_1u)_{Q^+_r(y_1)}|^p)_{Q^+_r(y_1)}\\&\le C\kappa^{-\alpha p}(|DD_1u|^p)_{Q^+_{\kappa r}(y_1)}+C\kappa^{d+\theta+2}(|f|^p)_{Q^+_{\kappa r}(y_1)},\end{aligned}$$

where $C=C(d,\delta,p,\theta,\alpha)$.

Proof. Denote $v=D_1u$. Then v satisfies

$$v_t-D_i(a_{ij}D_jv)=D_1f$$

in $Q^+_{\kappa r}(y_1)$ with the Dirichlet boundary condition $v=0$ on $\{x_1=0\}$. By a scaling argument, it is sufficient to set $\kappa r=8$. We consider two cases.

Case 1: $y_1\in[0,1]$. Since $r=8/\kappa\le 1/4$, we have

$$Q^+_r(y_1)\subset Q^+_2\subset Q^+_4\subset Q^+_{\kappa r}(y_1).$$

Let η be a smooth function with support in $(-(\kappa r)^2,(\kappa r)^2)\times B_{\kappa r}(y_1,0)$ and $\eta=1$ in Q_4. By Theorem 3.4, there exists a unique solution $w\in\mathcal{H}^{1,0}_{p,\theta}(-\infty,0)=\mathcal{H}^1_{p,\theta}(-\infty,0)$ to the equation

$$w_t-D_i(a_{ij}D_jw)=D_1(f\eta)$$

in $(-\infty,0)\times\mathbb{R}^d_+$, satisfying

$$\|Dw\|_{p,\theta}\le C\|f\eta\|_{p,\theta}.$$

Due to the definition of η, this implies

$$\|Dw\|^p_{p,\theta}\le C\mu(Q^+_{\kappa r}(y_1))\,(|f|^p)_{Q^+_{\kappa r}(y_1)}\,. \tag{3.4}$$

By a standard mollification argument (see, for instance, [5, Theorem 4.7]), we may assume that w is smooth. Let $\hat{u}=v-w$, which is also smooth, and satisfies $\hat{u}=0$ on $\{x_1=0\}$ and

$$\hat{u}_t-D_i(a_{ij}D_j\hat{u})=0$$

in Q_4^+. By Corollary 3.3, we have

$$(|D\hat{u} - (D\hat{u})_{Q_r^+(y_1)}|^p)_{Q_r^+(y_1)} \le Cr^{\alpha p} \int_{Q_4^+} |D_1 \hat{u}|^p \, \mu(dx\, dt). \tag{3.5}$$

Combining (3.4), (3.5), and the triangle inequality, we reach

$$\begin{aligned}
&(|DD_1 u - (DD_1 u)_{Q_r^+(y_1)}|^p)_{Q_r^+(y_1)} \\
&\le C(|D\hat{u} - (D\hat{u})_{Q_r^+(y_1)}|^p)_{Q_r^+(y_1)} + C(|Dw|^p)_{Q_r^+(y_1)} \\
&\le Cr^{\alpha p}(|D\hat{u}|^p)_{Q_4^+} + C\mu(Q_r^+(y_1))^{-1}\mu(Q_{\kappa r}^+(y_1))(|f|^p)_{Q_{\kappa r}^+(y_1)} \\
&\le Cr^{\alpha p}(|DD_1 u|^p)_{Q_4^+} + C\mu(Q_r^+(y_1))^{-1}\mu(Q_{\kappa r}^+(y_1))(|f|^p)_{Q_{\kappa r}^+(y_1)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Bearing in mind that $\mu(Q_r^+(y_1)) \ge Cr^{\sigma+2}$, where $\sigma = \max\{d, \theta\}$ and $r = 8/\kappa$, we prove the lemma for Case 1.

Case 2: $y_1 > 1$. This is essentially an interior case. Since $r = 8/\kappa \le 1/4$, we have

$$Q_r^+(y_1) = Q_r(y_1) \subset Q_{1/4}(y_1) \subset Q_{1/2}(y_1) \subset Q_{\kappa r}^+(y_1).$$

As in Case 1, we take a smooth function η with support in $(-(\kappa r)^2, (\kappa r)^2) \times B_{\kappa r}(y_1, 0)$ and $\eta = 1$ on $Q_{1/2}(y_1)$. Then by Theorem 3.4, there exists a unique solution $w \in \mathcal{H}^1_{p,\theta}(-\infty, 0)$ of the equation

$$w_t - D_i(a_{ij} D_j w) = D_1(f\eta)$$

in $(-\infty, 0) \times \mathbb{R}^d_+$, satisfying

$$\|Dw\|_{p,\theta} \le C\|f\eta\|_{p,\theta}.$$

Then we get

$$\|Dw\|_{p,\theta}^p \le C\mu(Q_{\kappa r}^+(y_1)) \, (|f|^p)_{Q_{\kappa r}^+(y_1)}. \tag{3.6}$$

For the same reason as before, we may assume that w is smooth and so is $\hat{u} = D_1 u - w$. It is easily seen that

$$\hat{u}_t - a_{ij} D_{ij} \hat{u} = 0 \quad \text{in} \quad Q_{1/2}(y_1).$$

By Lemma 3.2, we have

$$\|D\hat{u}\|_{C^{\alpha/2,\alpha}(Q_{1/4}(y_1))} \le C\|D\hat{u}\|_{L_p(Q_{1/2}(y_1))}.$$

From this and (3.6),

$$\begin{aligned}
&(|DD_1 u - (DD_1 u)_{Q_r(y_1)}|^p)_{Q_r(y_1)} \\
&\le C(|D\hat{u} - (D\hat{u})_{Q_r(y_1)}|^p)_{Q_r(y_1)} + C(|Dw|^p)_{Q_r(y_1)} \\
&\le Cr^{\alpha p}\|D\hat{u}\|^p_{C^{\alpha/2,\alpha}(Q_{1/4}(y_1))} + C\mu(Q_r(y_1))^{-1}\mu(Q_{\kappa r}^+(y_1))(|f|^p)_{Q_{\kappa r}^+(y_1)} \\
&\le Cr^{\alpha p}\|D\hat{u}\|^p_{L_p(Q_{1/2}(y_1))} + C\mu(Q_r(y_1))^{-1}\mu(Q_{\kappa r}^+(y_1))(|f|^p)_{Q_{\kappa r}^+(y_1)}.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.7}$$

Since for any $x_1 \in (y_1 - 1/2, y_1 + 1/2)$,

$$C_1 \le \frac{x_1^{\theta-d}}{\mu(Q_{1/2}(y_1))} \le C_2,$$

where $C_{1,2} = C_{1,2}(d,\theta)$, by (3.7), (3.6), and the triangle inequality, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}&(|DD_1u - (DD_1u)_{Q_r(y_1)}|^p)_{Q_r(y_1)}\\&\le Cr^{\alpha p}(|DD_1u|^p)_{Q_{1/2}(y_1)} + C\mu(Q_r(y_1))^{-1}\mu(Q^+_{\kappa r}(y_1))(|f|^p)_{Q^+_{\kappa r}(y_1)}.\end{aligned}$$

Taking into account that $\mu(Q_r(y_1)) \ge Nr^{d+2}\mu(Q_8^+(y_1))$, we prove the lemma for the second case. □

It remains to estimate $D_{ij}u$ with $i,j > 1$. Let us first state a Poincaré inequality in weighted L_p spaces.

Lemma 3.6. *Let $a \in \overline{\mathbb{R}^+}$, $\alpha \in (-1,\infty)$, $r \in (0,\infty)$, $p \in [1,\infty)$, $\nu(dx) = (x_1)^\alpha\,dx$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d_+$, and $u \in C^\infty_{loc}(\overline{\mathbb{R}^d_+})$. Then*

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{B_r^+(a)}\int_{B_r^+(a)} |u(x)-u(y)|^p\,\nu(dx)\,\nu(dy)\\&\le Cr^p\nu(B_r^+(a))\int_{B_r^+(a)} |Du|^p\,\nu(dx),\end{aligned} \tag{3.8}$$

where $C = C(d,p,\alpha)$.

Proof. When $\alpha \in [0,\infty)$, the inequality is proved in [13, Lemma 4.1] with a missing constant depending on d. For the sake of completeness, we here present a proof when $\alpha \in (-1,\infty)$. Since the weight is with respect to x_1, we only prove (3.8) for $d = 1$. In fact, to prove (3.8) for $d > 1$ we just need to combine the case when $d = 1$ with the unweighted Poincaré inequality.

Due to scaling, it suffices to prove (3.8) with $r = 1$. We further assume $a \in (0,2)$. Indeed, if $a \ge 2$, the inequality (3.8) is equivalent to the usual Poincaré inequality without weights. For each $x,y \in ((a-1)^+, a+1)$, by Hölder's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}|u(x)-u(y)|^p &= \Big|\int_{\min\{x,y\}}^{\max\{x,y\}} u'(z)\,dz\Big|^p\\&\le C\left(y^{1-\alpha q/p} + x^{1-\alpha q/p}\right)^{p/q}\int_{\min\{x,y\}}^{\max\{x,y\}} |u'(z)|^p z^\alpha\,dz\\&\le C\left(y^{1-\alpha q/p} + x^{1-\alpha q/p}\right)^{p/q}\int_{(a-1)^+}^{a+1} |u'(z)|^p z^\alpha\,dz,\end{aligned}$$

where $1/p + 1/q = 1$ and $C = C(p,\alpha)$. Then, to conclude (3.8), we integrate the above inequalities with respect to $\nu(dx)$ and $\nu(dy)$, and use the fact that $a \in (0,2)$. □

In the sequel, we denote the standard parabolic cylinder in $\mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ as

$$\hat{Q}_r^{d+1}(X) = (t-r^2,t)\times\hat{B}_r(x),$$

where $\hat{B}_r(x)$ is the Euclidean ball in $\mathbb{R}^d$ with radius r and center x. For a function f on $\mathbb{R}^{d+1}$, we define the average of f in $\hat{Q}_r^{d+1}(X)$ without weight as

$$\langle f\rangle_{\hat{Q}_r^{d+1}(X)} = \frac{1}{|\hat{Q}_r^{d+1}(X)|}\int_{\hat{Q}_r^{d+1}(X)} f(t,x)\,dx\,dt.$$

Theorem 3.7. *Let $p\in(1,\infty)$ and $u\in C^\infty_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ satisfy*

$$-u_t + a_{ij}(t)D_{ij}u = f \quad in \quad \mathbb{R}^{d+1}.$$

Then there exists a constant $C=C(d,\delta,p)$ such that for any $\kappa\geq 4, r>0$, we have

$$\left\langle |D^2u - \langle D^2u\rangle_{\hat{Q}_r^{d+1}}|^p\right\rangle_{\hat{Q}_r^{d+1}} \leq C\kappa^{-p}\langle |D^2u|^p\rangle_{\hat{Q}_{\kappa r}^{d+1}} + C\kappa^{d+2}\langle |f|^p\rangle_{\hat{Q}_{\kappa r}^{d+1}}.$$

Proof. See [23, Theorem 5.1]. □

To estimate $D^2_{x'}u$, we introduce the following notation. For $\mathfrak{y}_1\geq 0$, set $B_r^{1+}(\mathfrak{y}_1) = ((\mathfrak{y}_1-r)^+, \mathfrak{y}_1+r)\subset\mathbb{R}$, $\mu_1(dx_1) = x_1^{\theta-d}\,dx_1$, and

$$\mu_1(B_r^{1+}(\mathfrak{y}_1)) = \int_{(\mathfrak{y}_1-r)^+}^{\mathfrak{y}_1+r} x_1^{\theta-d}\,dx_1.$$

Lemma 3.8. *Let $p\in(1,\infty), \theta\in(d-1,d-1+p), r>0, \kappa\geq 32$, and $\mathfrak{y}_1\geq 0$. Assume that $f\in\mathbb{L}_{p,\theta}(Q^+_{\kappa r}(\mathfrak{y}_1))$ and $u\in C^\infty_{loc}(\overline{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_+})$ is a solution of*

$$-u_t + a_{ij}D_{ij}u = f \tag{3.9}$$

in $Q^+_{\kappa r}(\mathfrak{y}_1)$ with $D_1u=0$ on $\{x_1=0\}$. Then there exist constants $C=C(d,\delta,p,\theta)$ and $\alpha=\alpha(d,p,\theta)>0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}&(|D^2_{x'}u - (D^2_{x'}u)_{Q_r^+(\mathfrak{y}_1)}|^p)_{Q_r^+(\mathfrak{y}_1)}\\ &\leq C\kappa^{-\alpha}(|D^2_{x'}u|^p)_{Q^+_{\kappa r}(\mathfrak{y}_1)} + C\kappa^{d+\theta+2}\big((|f|^p)_{Q^+_{\kappa r}(\mathfrak{y}_1)} + (|DD_1u|^p)_{Q^+_{\kappa r}(\mathfrak{y}_1)}\big).\end{aligned}$$

Proof. By scaling, we may assume that $\kappa r = 8$. In this case $r\leq 1/4$ because $\kappa\geq 32$. Let $\eta=\eta(t,x')\in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}^{d-1})$ with a unit integral such that $\mathrm{supp}(\eta)\subset Q_r^d$ and

$$|D_{x'}\eta|\leq C(d)\,r^{-d-2} \quad \text{on } Q_r^d, \tag{3.10}$$

where

$$Q_r^d := (-r^2,0)\times B_r^{d-1} := (-r^2,0)\times\{|x'|\leq r\}.$$

We consider two cases.

Case (i): $\mathfrak{y}_1\in[0,1]$. By Hölder's inequality and the triangle inequality, it is easily seen that

$$\begin{aligned}&⨍_{Q_r^+(\mathfrak{y}_1)} |D^2_{x'}u - (D^2_{x'}u)_{Q_r^+(\mathfrak{y}_1)}|^p\,\mu(dx\,dt)\\ &\leq C⨍_{Q_r^+(\mathfrak{y}_1)}⨍_{Q_r^+(\mathfrak{y}_1)} |D^2_{x'}u(t,x) - D^2_{x'}u(s,y)|^p\,\mu(dx\,dt)\,\mu(dy\,ds).\end{aligned} \tag{3.11}$$

Since, by the triangle inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}
&|D^2_{x'}u(t,x) - D^2_{x'}u(s,y)|^p \\
&\le C\Big|D^2_{x'}u(t,x) - \int_{Q_r^d} \eta(\sigma,z')D^2_{x'}u(\sigma,x_1,z')\,dz'\,d\sigma\Big|^p \\
&\quad + C\Big|D^2_{x'}u(s,y) - \int_{Q_r^d} \eta(\sigma,z')D^2_{x'}u(\sigma,y_1,z')\,dz'\,d\sigma\Big|^p \\
&\quad + C\Big|\int_{Q_r^d} \eta(\sigma,z')(D^2_{x'}u(\sigma,x_1,z') - D^2_{x'}u(\sigma,y_1,z'))\,dz'\,d\sigma\Big|^p,
\end{aligned}$$

the right-hand side of (3.11) is bounded by $C(I+II)$, where

$$\begin{aligned}
I &:= \fint_{Q_r^+(\mathfrak{y}_1)} \Big|D^2_{x'}u(t,x_1,x') - \int_{Q_r^d} \eta(s,y')D^2_{x'}u(s,x_1,y')\,dy'\,ds\Big|^p\,\mu(dx\,dt), \\
II &:= \fint_{B_r^{1+}(\mathfrak{y}_1)} \fint_{B_r^{1+}(\mathfrak{y}_1)} \Big|\int_{Q_r^d} (D^2_{x'}u(t,x_1,z') - D^2_{x'}u(t,y_1,z'))\eta(t,z')\,dz'\,dt\Big|^p \\
&\quad \cdot \mu_1(dx_1)\,\mu_1(dy_1).
\end{aligned}$$

Let us now estimate I and II separately and first consider II. By integrating by parts and Hölder's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Big|\int_{Q_r^d} (D^2_{x'}u(t,x_1,z') - D^2_{x'}u(t,y_1,z'))\eta(t,z')dz'\,dt\Big|^p \\
&= \Big|\int_{Q_r^d} (D_{x'}u(t,x_1,z') - D_{x'}u(t,y_1,z'))D_{x'}\eta(t,z')dz'\,dt\Big|^p \\
&\le \int_{Q_r^d} |D_{x'}u(t,x_1,z') - D_{x'}u(t,y_1,z')|^p dz'\,dt \cdot \Big(\int_{Q_r^d} |D_{x'}\eta|^q dz'\,dt\Big)^{\frac{p}{q}},
\end{aligned}$$

where $1/p + 1/q = 1$. From (3.10), we have

$$\Big(\int_{Q_r^d} |D_{x'}\eta|^q d\sigma\,dz'\Big)^{\frac{p}{q}} \le Cr^{-(d+1+p)}.$$

We plug the two inequalities above into II to achieve

$$\begin{aligned}
&II \le \\
&Cr^{-(d+1+p)} \fint_{B_r^{1+}(\mathfrak{y}_1)} \fint_{B_r^{1+}(\mathfrak{y}_1)} \int_{Q_r^d} |D_{x'}u(t,x_1,z') - D_{x'}u(t,y_1,z')|^p dz'\,dt \\
&\cdot \mu_1(dx_1)\,\mu_1(dy_1).
\end{aligned}$$

Applying Lemma 3.6 with $d=1$, we get

$$II \le C \fint_{Q_r^+(\mathfrak{y}_1)} |D_1 D_{x'}u|^p\,\mu(dx\,dt) \le C\kappa^{d+\theta+2}(|DD_1u|^p)_{Q_{\kappa r}^+(\mathfrak{y}_1)}$$

because $|Q_r^+(\mathfrak{y}_1)| \ge Cr^{d+\theta+2}$.

Next, we estimate I, which can be written as

$$I = \fint_{Q_r^+(\mathfrak{y}_1)} \Big|\int_{Q_r^d} \eta(s,y')(D^2_{x'}u(t,x_1,x') - D^2_{x'}u(s,x_1,y'))\,dy'\,ds\Big|^p\,\mu(dx\,dt).$$

By Hölder's inequality,

$$I \le \fint_{Q_r^+(\mathfrak{y}_1)} \int_{Q_r^d} |D_{x'}^2 u(t,x_1,x') - D_{x'}^2 u(s,x_1,y')|^p \, dy' \, ds \, \mu(dx\, dt) \cdot \left(\int_{Q_r^d} |\eta|^q \, dy' \, ds \right)^{\frac{p}{q}}.$$

Since

$$\left(\int_{Q_r^d} |\eta|^q \, dy' \, ds \right)^{\frac{p}{q}} \le C r^{-(d+1)},$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} I \le & C \fint_{Q_r^+(\mathfrak{y}_1)} \fint_{Q_r^d} |D_{x'}^2 u(t,x_1,x') - D_{x'}^2 u(s,x_1,y')|^p \, dy' \, ds \, \mu(dx\, dt) \\ = & C \fint_{B_r^{1+}(\mathfrak{y}_1)} I(x_1) \, x_1^{\theta-d} \, dx_1, \end{aligned} \tag{3.12}$$

where

$$I(x_1) = \fint_{Q_r^d} \fint_{Q_r^d} |D_{x'}^2 u(t,x_1,x') - D_{x'}^2 u(s,x_1,y')|^p \, dy' \, ds \, dx' \, dt.$$

We now estimate $I(x_1)$ by writing the equation (3.9) as

$$-u_t + \sum_{i,j>1} a_{ij} D_{ij} u = -a_{11} D_{11} u - \sum_{j=2}^{d} (a_{1j} + a_{j1}) D_{1j} u + f.$$

Here, for each fixed $x_1 \in (0,\infty)$, we regard $u(t,x_1,x')$ as a solution to the above equation defined in $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$. Then thanks to Theorem 3.7 with d in place of $d+1$ and the triangle inequality, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & I(x_1) \le C \fint_{Q_r^d} |D_{x'}^2 u(t,x_1,x') - (D_{x'}^2 u)_{Q_r^d}(x_1)|^p \, dx' \, dt \\ & \le C\kappa^{-p} \langle |D_{x'}^2 u|^p \rangle_{Q_{\kappa r}^d}(x_1) + C\kappa^{d+1} \langle |f|^p \rangle_{Q_{\kappa r}^d}(x_1) + C\kappa^{d+1} \langle |DD_1 u|^p \rangle_{Q_{\kappa r}^d}(x_1), \end{aligned}$$

where, for fixed x_1, $\langle |g|^p \rangle_{Q_{\kappa r}^d}(x_1)$ is the unweighted average of g with respect to (t,x') in the d dimensional parabolic cylinder with radius κr. We plug the inequality above into (3.12) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} I \le C \fint_{B_r^{1+}(\mathfrak{y}_1)} \Big(& \kappa^{-p} \langle |D_{x'}^2 u|^p \rangle_{Q_{\kappa r}^d}(x_1) + \kappa^{d+1} \langle |f|^p \rangle_{Q_{\kappa r}^d}(x_1) \\ & + \kappa^{d+1} \langle |DD_1 u|^p \rangle_{Q_{\kappa r}^d}(x_1) \Big) x_1^{\theta-d} \, dx_1. \end{aligned} \tag{3.13}$$

Bearing in mind that $\mu_1(B_r^{1+}(\mathfrak{y}_1)) \geq Cr^{\zeta+1-d}$, where $\zeta = \max\{d, \theta\}$, and $r = 8/\kappa$, we obtain from (3.13) that

$$I \leq C\kappa^{-(p+d-\zeta-1)}(|D_{x'}^2 u|^p)_{Q_{\kappa r}^+(\mathfrak{y}_1)} + C\kappa^{\zeta+2}\left((|f|^p)_{Q_{\kappa r}^+(\mathfrak{y}_1)} + (|DD_1 u|^p)_{Q_{\kappa r}^+(\mathfrak{y}_1)}\right).$$

By the definition of ζ, $p + d - \zeta - 1 > 0$. Combining the estimates of I and II, we complete the proof of Case (i) with $\alpha = p + d - \zeta - 1$.

Case (ii): $\mathfrak{y}_1 > 1$. Set $v = D_k u$, $k = 1, \ldots, d$, and note that v satisfies the divergence type equation

$$v_t - D_i(a_{ij} D_j v) = D_k f$$

in $B_{\kappa r}(\mathfrak{y}_1)$. Since this is an interior estimate, we do not care about the boundary value of v on $\{x_1 = 0\}$. Then we repeat the second part of the proof of Lemma 3.5 with D_k in place of D_1. The lemma is proved. □

4. PROOF OF THEOREM 2.3

In this section, we deal with operators with coefficients depending on both x and t. We denote $L = a_{ij} D_{ij}$ and assume $p > 1$, $\lambda \geq 0$, and $\theta \in (d-1, d-1+p)$.

First we need the following lemma.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $0 < r \leq R < \infty$ and $X = (t, x)$, $Y = (s, y) \in \overline{\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1}}$. Then*

$$\mu\left(Q_r^+(X)\right) \leq C(d, \theta)\, \mu\left(Q_R^+(Y)\right) \tag{4.1}$$

provided that $Q_r^+(X) \cap Q_R^+(Y) \neq \emptyset$.

Proof. By scaling, without loss of generality we may assume that $R = 1$. We then consider two cases depending on y_1.

Case 1: $y_1 > 10$. In this case, we have

$$x_1 > 8, \quad 1 < \max\{y_1 + 1, x_1 + r\} / \min\{y_1 - 1, x_1 - r\} < 11/7,$$

which allows us to use the Lebesgue measure in comparing $\mu\left(Q_r^+(X)\right)$ and $\mu\left(Q_1^+(Y)\right)$. Therefore, (4.1) clearly holds since $r \leq 1$.

Case 2: $y_1 \in [0, 10]$. In this case, we have $x_1 \in [0, 12)$. It is then easily seen that $\mu(Q_1^+(Y))$ is bounded from below by a constant $c(d, \theta) > 0$ and $\mu(Q_r^+(X)) \leq \mu(Q_1^+(X))$ is bounded from above by a constant $C(d, \theta) > 0$. Thus, (4.1) still holds.

The lemma is proved. □

The following two lemmas are mean oscillation estimates for the operator $a_{ij}(t, x) D_{ij}$. We prove them by using the mean oscillation estimates for $a_{ij}(t) D_{ij}$ proved in Section 3 combined with a perturbation argument.

Lemma 4.2. *Let $R > 0$, $\kappa \geq 32$, and $\beta, \beta' \in (1, \infty)$ satisfying $1/\beta + 1/\beta' = 1$. Suppose that $u \in C_{loc}^\infty(\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^{d+1}})$ is compactly supported on $\overline{Q_R^+(X_1)}$, where*

$X_1 = (\hat{t}, \hat{x}) \in \overline{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_+}$. *Moreover,* $D_1 u = 0$ *on* $\{x_1 = 0\}$ *and* $f := -u_t + Lu$. *Then for any* $r > 0$ *and* $Y = (s, y) \in \overline{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_+}$, *we have*

$$\begin{aligned}(|DD_1 u - (DD_1 u)_{Q_r^+(Y)}|^p)_{Q_r^+(Y)} &\le C_0 \kappa^{-p/2} (|DD_1 u|^p)_{Q_{\kappa r}^+(Y)} \\ &+ C_0 \kappa^{d+\theta+2} (|f|^p)_{Q_{\kappa r}^+(Y)} + C_1 \kappa^{d+\theta+2} (A_R^{\#})^{1/\beta'} (|D^2 u|^{\beta p})^{1/\beta}_{Q_{\kappa r}^+(Y)}, \end{aligned} \tag{4.2}$$

where $C_0 = C_0(d, \delta, p, \theta)$ *and* $C_1 = C_1(d, \delta, p, \theta, \beta)$.

Proof. Throughout the proof, we assume $Q_R^+(X_1) \cap Q_{\kappa r}^+(Y) \neq \emptyset$. Otherwise, (4.2) holds trivially. Fix a $z \in \overline{\mathbb{R}^d_+}$ and set

$$L_z u = a_{ij}(t, z) D_{ij} u(t, x).$$

Then we have

$$-u_t + L_z u = f + (a_{ij}(t, z) - a_{ij}(t, x)) D_{ij} u(t, x) := \hat{f}.$$

It follows from Lemma 3.5 with $\alpha = 1/2$ and a translation of the coordinates that

$$\begin{aligned}&(|DD_1 u - (DD_1 u)_{Q_r^+(Y)}|^p)_{Q_r^+(Y)} \\ &\le C_0 \kappa^{-p/2} (|DD_1 u|^p)_{Q_{\kappa r}^+(Y)} + C_0 \kappa^{d+\theta+2} (|\hat{f}|^p)_{Q_{\kappa r}^+(Y)}, \end{aligned} \tag{4.3}$$

where $C_0 = C_0(d, \delta, p, \theta)$. By the definition of $\hat{f}$, the triangle inequality, and the fact that u vanishes outside $\overline{Q_R^+(X_1)}$, we have

$$(|\hat{f}|^p)_{Q_{\kappa r}^+(Y)} \le C (|f|^p)_{Q_{\kappa r}^+(Y)} + C_0 I_z, \tag{4.4}$$

where

$$I_z = \left(|(a_{ij}(t, z) - a_{ij}(t, x)) \chi_{Q_R^+(X_1)} D_{ij} u|^p \right)_{Q_{\kappa r}^+(Y)},$$

and $\chi_{Q_R^+(X_1)}$ is the indicator function of $Q_R^+(X_1)$. Denote B^+ to be $B_{\kappa r}^+(y)$ if $\kappa r < R$, or to be $B_R^+(\hat{x})$ otherwise. Define Q^+ in the same fashion. We note that

$$\mu(Q^+) \le C(d, \theta) \mu \left(Q_{\kappa r}^+(Y) \right) \tag{4.5}$$

provided that $Q_R^+(X_1) \cap Q_{\kappa r}^+(Y) \neq \emptyset$. It is obvious if $\kappa r < R$, i.e., $Q^+ = Q_{\kappa r}^+(Y)$. If $\kappa r \ge R$, the inequality is proved in Lemma 4.1.

Combining (4.3) and (4.4) and taking the average of each term with respect to z in B^+, we reach

$$\begin{aligned}(|DD_1 u - (DD_1 u)_{Q_r^+(Y)}|^p)_{Q_r^+(Y)} &\le C_0 \kappa^{-p/2} (|DD_1 u|^p)_{Q_{\kappa r}^+(Y)} \\ &+ C_0 \kappa^{d+\theta+2} (|f|^p)_{Q_{\kappa r}^+(Y)} + C_0 \kappa^{d+\theta+2} \fint_{B^+} I_z \, \mu_d(dz). \end{aligned} \tag{4.6}$$

Since u vanishes outside $\overline{Q_R^+(X_1)}$, by Hölder's inequality, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\fint_{B^+} I_z \,\mu_d(dz) \\
&= \frac{1}{\mu(Q^+_{\kappa r}(Y))} \fint_{B^+} \int_{Q^+_{\kappa r}(Y)\cap Q^+_R(X_1)} |(a_{ij}(t,z)-a_{ij}(t,x))D_{ij}u|^p \\
&\quad \cdot \mu(dx\,dt)\,\mu_d(dz) \\
&\le \frac{1}{\mu(Q^+_{\kappa r}(Y))} \fint_{B^+} \Big(\int_{Q^+} |a_{ij}(t,z)-a_{ij}(t,x)|^{\beta' p}\,\mu(dx\,dt)\Big)^{1/\beta'} \mu_d(dz) \\
&\quad \cdot \Big(\int_{Q^+_{\kappa r}(Y)\cap Q^+_R(X_1)} |D^2u|^{\beta p}\,\mu(dx\,dt)\Big)^{1/\beta}. \qquad (4.7)
\end{aligned}$$

By the boundedness of a_{ij}, Hölder's inequality, and the definition of osc_x, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\fint_{B^+} \Big(\int_{Q^+} |a_{ij}(t,z)-a_{ij}(t,x)|^{\beta' p}\,\mu(dx\,dt)\Big)^{1/\beta'} \mu_d(dz) \\
&\le C_1 \Big(\fint_{B^+} \int_{Q^+} |a_{ij}(t,z)-a_{ij}(t,x)|\,\mu(dx\,dt)\,\mu_d(dz)\Big)^{1/\beta'} \\
&\le C_1 \left(\mu(Q^+) \operatorname{osc}_x(a_{ij}, Q^+)\right)^{1/\beta'}, \qquad (4.8)
\end{aligned}$$

where $C_1 = C_1(d,\delta,p,\beta)$. From (4.7), (4.8), and (4.5), we obtain

$$\fint_{B^+} I_z \,\mu_d(dz) \le C_1 (A_R^{\#})^{1/\beta'} (|D^2u|^{\beta p})^{1/\beta}_{Q^+_{\kappa r}(Y)}. \qquad (4.9)$$

Combining (4.6) and (4.9), we get (4.2). The lemma is proved. □

Following exactly the proof of Lemma 4.2 with Lemma 3.8 in place of Lemma 3.5, we obtain the lemma below.

Lemma 4.3. *Let $R>0, \kappa \ge 32$, and $\beta, \beta' \in (1,\infty)$ satisfying $1/\beta + 1/\beta' = 1$. Let $u \in C^\infty_{loc}(\overline{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_+})$ be compactly supported on $\overline{Q_R^+(X_1)}$, where $X_1 \in \overline{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_+}$. Moreover, $D_1 u = 0$ on $\{x_1 = 0\}$ and $f := -u_t + Lu$. Then for any $r>0$ and $Y=(s,y) \in \overline{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_+}$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned}
&(|D^2_{x'}u - (D^2_{x'}u)_{Q^+_r(Y)}|^p)_{Q^+_r(Y)} \\
&\le C_0 \kappa^{-\alpha} (|D^2_{x'}u|^p)_{Q^+_{\kappa r}(Y)} + C_0 \kappa^{d+\theta+2} (|f|^p + |DD_1 u|^p)_{Q^+_{\kappa r}(Y)} \\
&\quad + C_1 \kappa^{d+\theta+2} (A_R^{\#})^{1/\beta'} (|D^2u|^{\beta p})^{1/\beta}_{Q^+_{\kappa r}(Y)},
\end{aligned}$$

where $C_0 = C_0(d,\delta,p,\theta)$, $C_1 = C_1(d,\delta,p,\theta,\beta)$, and $\alpha = \alpha(d,\theta,p) > 0$.

Next we recall the Hardy–Littlewood maximal function theorem and the Fefferman–Stein theorem on sharp functions. Let

$$\mathcal{Q} = \{Q_r^+(z) : z = (t,x) \in \overline{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_+}, r>0\}.$$

For a function g defined on $\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_+$, the weighted (parabolic) maximal and sharp functions of g are given by

$$\mathcal{M}g(t,x) = \sup_{Q\in\mathcal{Q},(t,x)\in Q} \fint_Q |g(s,y)|\,\mu(dy\,ds),$$
$$g^{\#}(t,x) = \sup_{Q\in\mathcal{Q},(t,x)\in Q} \fint_Q |g(s,y)-(g)_Q|\,\mu(dy\,ds).$$

For any $\theta > d-1$ and $g \in \mathbb{L}_{p,\theta}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_+)$, we have

$$\|g\|_{\mathbb{L}_{p,\theta}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_+)} \le C\|g^{\#}\|_{\mathbb{L}_{p,\theta}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_+)}, \quad \|\mathcal{M}g\|_{\mathbb{L}_{p,\theta}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_+)} \le C\|g\|_{\mathbb{L}_{p,\theta}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_+)},$$

where $p \in (1,\infty)$ and $C = C(d,p,\theta)$. The first inequality above is known as the Fefferman–Stein theorem on sharp functions and the second one is the Hardy–Littlewood maximal function theorem, for instance see [19, Chapter 3]

Now we are ready to prove our main theorem.

Proof of Theorem 2.3. By the method of continuity, it is enough to prove the a priori estimate (2.3). Moreover, since the set of functions in $C^\infty(\overline{(-\infty,T)\times\mathbb{R}^d_+})$ vanishing for large (t,x) is dense in $W^{1,2}_{p,\theta}(-\infty,T)$, we only need to prove (2.3) for infinitely differentiable functions with compact support. In this case, the proof of (2.3) can be divided into several steps.

Step 1: We consider $\lambda = 0$, $b_i = c = 0$, $T = \infty$, and $u \in C^\infty(\overline{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_+})$ vanishing outside $\overline{Q^+_{R_0}(X_1)}$ for some $X_1 \in \overline{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}}$, where R_0 is from Assumption 2.1. Let $\kappa \ge 32$ be a constant to be determined later. We fix $q \in (1,p)$ and $\beta \in (1,\infty)$, depending only on p and θ, such that $\beta q < p$ and $\theta < d-1+q$. Let β' be such that $1/\beta + 1/\beta' = 1$. By applying Lemma 4.2 with q in place of p and using Assumption 2.1, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}(DD_1u)^{\#}(Y) \le& C_0\kappa^{-1/2}\mathcal{M}^{1/q}(|DD_1u|^q)(Y) + C_0\kappa^{(d+\theta+2)/q}\mathcal{M}^{1/q}(|f|^q)(Y)\\ &+ C_0\kappa^{(d+\theta+2)/q}\rho^{1/(\beta' q)}\mathcal{M}^{1/(\beta q)}(|D^2u|^{\beta q})(Y)\end{aligned}$$

for any $Y \in \overline{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}_+}$, where $C_0 = C_0(d,\delta,p,\theta)$. This estimate, together with Fefferman–Stein theorem on sharp functions and the Hardy–Littlewood theorem on maximal functions, gives

$$\begin{aligned}&\|DD_1u\|_{p,\theta} \le C\|(DD_1u)^{\#}\|_{p,\theta}\\ &\le C_0\kappa^{-1/2}\|\mathcal{M}^{1/q}(|DD_1u|^q)\|_{p,\theta} + C_0\kappa^{(d+\theta+2)/q}\|\mathcal{M}^{1/q}(|f|^q)\|_{p,\theta}\\ &\quad + C_0\kappa^{(d+\theta+2)/q}\rho^{1/(\beta' q)}\|\mathcal{M}^{1/(\beta q)}(|D^2u|^{\beta q})\|_{p,\theta}\\ &\le C_0\kappa^{-1/2}\|DD_1u\|_{p,\theta} + C_0\kappa^{(d+\theta+2)/q}\|f\|_{p,\theta} + C_0\kappa^{(d+\theta+2)/q}\rho^{1/(\beta' q)}\|D^2u\|_{p,\theta}.\end{aligned} \tag{4.10}$$

In the same way, we apply Lemma 4.3 instead of Lemma 4.2 to obtain the estimate of $D^2_{x'}u$:

$$\|D^2_{x'}u\|_{p,\theta} \le C_0\kappa^{-\alpha/q}\|D^2_{x'}u\|_{p,\theta} + C_0\kappa^{(d+\theta+2)/q}(\|f\|_{p,\theta} + \|DD_1u\|_{p,\theta}) + C_0\kappa^{(d+\theta+2)/q}\rho^{1/(\beta' q)}\|D^2u\|_{p,\theta}. \tag{4.11}$$

By choosing κ sufficiently large, from (4.10) and (4.11) we obtain

$$\|DD_1u\|_{p,\theta} \le C_0\|f\|_{p,\theta} + C_0\rho^{1/(\beta' q)}\|D^2u\|_{p,\theta}, \tag{4.12}$$

$$\|D^2_{x'}u\|_{p,\theta} \le C_0(\|f\|_{p,\theta} + \|DD_1u\|_{p,\theta}) + C_0\rho^{1/(\beta' q)}\|D^2u\|_{p,\theta}. \tag{4.13}$$

We combine (4.12) and (4.13) together to get

$$\|D^2u\|_{p,\theta} \le C_0\|f\|_{p,\theta} + C_0\rho^{1/(\beta' q)}\|D^2u\|_{p,\theta}.$$

Taking ρ sufficiently small depending only on d, δ, p, θ, we arrive at

$$\|D^2u\|_{p,\theta} \le C_0\|f\|_{p,\theta}. \tag{4.14}$$

On the other hand, since

$$u_t = a_{ij}D_{ij}u - f,$$

we have

$$\|u_t\|_{p,\theta} \le C_0\|f\|_{p,\theta} + C_0\|D^2u\|_{p,\theta}. \tag{4.15}$$

By Hardy's inequality (Lemma 3.1) with $r = \infty$,

$$\|M^{-1}D_1u\|_{p,\theta} \le C_0\|D_{11}u\|_{p,\theta}. \tag{4.16}$$

Combining (4.14), (4.15), and (4.16), we obtain (2.3) for $\lambda = 0$.

Step 2: We remove the assumption that u is compactly supported in $Q^+_{R_0}(X_1)$. By a standard partition of the unity argument with (4.14)–(4.16) (cf. [19, Theorem 1.6.4]) we see that

$$\|u_t\|_{p,\theta} + \|M^{-1}D_1u\| + \|D^2u\|_{p,\theta} \le C_0\|f\|_{p,\theta} + C_1\|u\|_{p,\theta}, \tag{4.17}$$

where $C_0 = C_0(d, \delta, p, \theta)$ and $C_1 = C_1(d, \delta, p, \theta, R_0)$.

Step 3: We still assume that $b_i = c = 0$ and $T = \infty$, but λ is not necessarily zero. In this case, we follow an idea of S. Agmon. Since

$$-u_t + a_{ij}D_{ij}u = f - \lambda u,$$

by (4.17) we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|u_t\|_{p,\theta} + \|M^{-1}D_1u\|_{p,\theta} + \|D^2u\|_{p,\theta} &\le C_0\|f - \lambda u\|_{p,\theta} + C_1\|u\|_{p,\theta}\\ &\le C_0\|f\|_{p,\theta} + (C_0\lambda + C_1)\|u\|_{p,\theta}.\end{aligned}$$

Hence it is sufficient to show that for large λ

$$\lambda\|u\|_{p,\theta} \le C_0\|f\|_{p,\theta}.$$

We pick a function $\zeta(y) \in C^\infty_0(\mathbb{R}), \zeta \not\equiv 0$ and introduce the following notation

$$z = (x, y), \quad \hat{u}(t, z) = u(t, x)\zeta(y)\cos(\sqrt{\lambda}y), \quad \hat{L}u = L(t, x)u(t, z) + u_{yy}(t, z).$$

Finally, set $\mathbb{R}^{d+2}_+ = \{(t,z) : x_1 > 0\}$ and

$$\mathbb{B}_r(z) = (x_1 - r, x_1 + r) \times B_r(x', y), \quad \mathbb{Q}_r(t,z) = (t - r^2, t) \times \mathbb{B}_r(z),$$

$$\mathbb{B}^+_r(z) = \mathbb{B}_r(z) \cap \{x_1 > 0\}, \quad \mathbb{Q}^+_r(t,z) = (t - r^2, t) \times \mathbb{B}^+_r(z).$$

For any $r > 0$, $Z = (t,z) \in \overline{\mathbb{R}^{d+2}_+}$, and $\hat{a}(t)$, we have

$$\fint_{\mathbb{B}^+_r(z)} |a_{ij}(t,x) - \hat{a}(t)| \, \mu_d(dx) \, dy \le C \fint_{B^+_r(x)} |a_{ij}(t,x) - \hat{a}(t)| \, \mu_d(dx),$$

where $C = C(d)$. In particular, by the definition of the osc_x and setting

$$\hat{a}(t) = \fint_{B^+_r(x)} a_{ij}(t,x) \, \mu_d(dx),$$

we have $\mathrm{osc}_z(a_{ij}, \mathbb{Q}^+_r(t,z)) \le C \, \mathrm{osc}_x(a_{ij}, Q^+_r(t,x))$. By a simple calculation,

$$\hat{L}\hat{u} = f \cos(\sqrt{\lambda} y)\zeta(y) + u\zeta'' \cos(\sqrt{\lambda} y) - 2\sqrt{\lambda} u \zeta' \sin(\sqrt{\lambda} y) := \hat{f}.$$

By (4.17) with $\hat{u}$ instead of u in dimension $d+2$,

$$|||D^2 \hat{u}|||_{p,\theta} \le C_0 |||\hat{f}|||_{p,\theta} + C_1 |||\hat{u}|||_{p,\theta}, \tag{4.18}$$

where $|||\cdot|||_{p,\theta}$ is the weighted L_p norm in $\mathbb{R}^{d+2}_+$ with respect to $\mu(dx\,dt)\,dy$. Note that for $\lambda > 1$,

$$c_1 \le \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\zeta(y) \cos(\sqrt{\lambda} y)|^p \, dy := A \le c_2, \tag{4.19}$$

where c_1 and c_2 are positive constants independent of λ. Moreover, A is bounded from above with ζ replaced by any derivatives of ζ and $\cos(\sqrt{\lambda} y)$ replaced by $\sin(\sqrt{\lambda} y)$. Then from (4.18), we have

$$|||D_{yy} \hat{u}|||_{p,\theta} \le |||D^2 \hat{u}|||_{p,\theta} \le C_0 \|f\|_{p,\theta} + C_1(1 + \sqrt{\lambda}) \|u\|_{p,\theta}. \tag{4.20}$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} D_{yy}\hat{u} = {} & u(t,x)\zeta''(y) \cos(\sqrt{\lambda} y) - 2\sqrt{\lambda} u(t,x) \zeta'(y) \sin(\sqrt{\lambda} y) \\ & - \lambda u(t,x) \zeta(y) \cos(\sqrt{\lambda} y), \end{aligned} \tag{4.21}$$

Combining (4.19), (4.20), and (4.21), we have

$$\lambda \|u\|_{p,\theta} \le C_0 \|f\|_{p,\theta} + C_1(1 + \sqrt{\lambda}) \|u\|_{p,\theta}. \tag{4.22}$$

After choosing λ sufficiently large depending on $d, \delta, p, \theta, R_0$ to absorb the term of u on the right-hand side of (4.22) to the left-hand side, we have

$$\lambda \|u\|_{p,\theta} \le C_0 \|f\|_{p,\theta},$$

where $C_0 = C_0(d, \delta, p, \theta)$. By the interpolation inequality

$$\sqrt{\lambda} \|Du\|_{p,\theta} \le C_0 \|D^2 u\|_{p,\theta} + C_0 \lambda \|u\|_{p,\theta},$$

we finish the proof of Step 3.

Step 4: We remove the assumption that $b_i = c = 0$ by moving the terms of b_i and c to the right-hand side

$$-u_t + a_{ij}D_{ij}u - \lambda u = f - b_i D_i u - cu.$$

By the conclusion in Step 3 with $b_i = c = 0$, there exists $\lambda_0 = \lambda_0(d, \delta, p, \theta, R_0)$ such that for any $\lambda \geq \lambda_0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|u_t\|_{p,\theta} + \lambda\|u\|_{p,\theta} + \sqrt{\lambda}\|Du\|_{p,\theta} + \|M^{-1}D_1 u\|_{p,\theta} + \|D^2 u\|_{p,\theta} \\
&\leq C_0\|f - b_i D_i u - cu\|_{p,\theta} \\
&\leq C_0\|f\|_{p,\theta} + C_0 K\|Du\|_{p,\theta} + C_0 K\|u\|_{p,\theta}.
\end{aligned}$$

By taking λ sufficiently large depending on d, δ, p, θ, R_0, and K, we get

$$\|u_t\|_{p,\theta} + \lambda\|u\|_{p,\theta} + \sqrt{\lambda}\|Du\|_{p,\theta} + \|M^{-1}u\|_{p,\theta} + \|D^2 u\|_{p,\theta} \leq C_0\|f\|_{p,\theta}.$$

Step 5: To remove the assumption that $T = \infty$, we simply follow the standard step in [4, Theorem 2.1] or [19, Theorem 6.4.1]. Therefore, the estimate (2.3) is proved.

Finally, in the case when $b_i = c = 0$ and $a_{ij} = a_{ij}(t)$, by using a scaling argument we can take $R_0 = 0$. The theorem is proved. □

References

[1] Filippo Chiarenza, Michele Frasca, and Placido Longo. Interior $W^{2,p}$ estimates for nondivergence elliptic equations with discontinuous coefficients. *Ricerche Mat.*, 40(1):149–168, 1991.

[2] Filippo Chiarenza, Michele Frasca, and Placido Longo. $W^{2,p}$-solvability of the Dirichlet problem for nondivergence elliptic equations with VMO coefficients. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 336(2):841–853, 1993.

[3] H. Dong. Parabolic equations with variably partially VMO coefficients. *Algebra i Analiz*, 23(3):150–174, 2011.

[4] H. Dong and D. Kim. Elliptic and parabolic equations with measurable coefficients in weighted Sobolev spaces. *ArXiv e-prints*, March 2014.

[5] H. Dong and H. Zhang. Conormal problem of higher-order parabolic systems. *ArXiv e-prints*, January 2014.

[6] Hongjie Dong. Solvability of parabolic equations in divergence form with partially BMO coefficients. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 258(7):2145–2172, 2010.

[7] Hongjie Dong and Doyoon Kim. L_p solvability of divergence type parabolic and elliptic systems with partially BMO coefficients. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, 40(3-4):357–389, 2011.

[8] Hongjie Dong and Doyoon Kim. On the L_p-solvability of higher order parabolic and elliptic systems with BMO coefficients. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 199(3):889–941, 2011.

[9] Doyoon Kim. Parabolic equations with measurable coefficients. II. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 334(1):534–548, 2007.

[10] Ildoo Kim, Kyeong-Hun Kim, and Kijung Lee. A weighted L_p-theory for divergence type parabolic PDEs with BMO coefficients on C^1-domains. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 412(2):589–612, 2014.

[11] Kyeong-Hun Kim. A weighted Sobolev space theory of parabolic stochastic PDEs on non-smooth domains. *J. Theoret. Probab.*, 27(1):107–136, 2014.

[12] Kyeong-Hun Kim and N. V. Krylov. On the Sobolev space theory of parabolic and elliptic equations in C^1 domains. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 36(2):618–642, 2004.

[13] Kyeong-Hun Kim and Kijung Lee. A weighted L_p-theory for parabolic PDEs with BMO coefficients on C^1-domains. *J. Differential Equations*, 254(2):368–407, 2013.
[14] V. Kozlov and A. I. Nazarov. Oblique derivative problem for non-divergence parabolic equations with discontinuous in time coefficients. *ArXiv e-prints*, January 2013.
[15] Vladimir Kozlov and Alexander Nazarov. The Dirichlet problem for non-divergence parabolic equations with discontinuous in time coefficients. *Math. Nachr.*, 282(9):1220–1241, 2009.
[16] N. V. Krylov. A W_2^n-theory of the Dirichlet problem for SPDEs in general smooth domains. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 98(3):389–421, 1994.
[17] N. V. Krylov. Weighted Sobolev spaces and Laplace's equation and the heat equations in a half space. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 24(9-10):1611–1653, 1999.
[18] N. V. Krylov. Parabolic and elliptic equations with VMO coefficients. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 32(1-3):453–475, 2007.
[19] N. V. Krylov. *Lectures on elliptic and parabolic equations in Sobolev spaces*, volume 96 of *Graduate Studies in Mathematics*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2008.
[20] N. V. Krylov. On divergence form SPDEs with VMO coefficients in a half space. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 119(6):2095–2117, 2009.
[21] N. V. Krylov and S. V. Lototsky. A Sobolev space theory of SPDEs with constant coefficients in a half space. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 31(1):19–33, 1999.
[22] N. V. Krylov and S. V. Lototsky. A Sobolev space theory of SPDEs with constant coefficients on a half line. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 30(2):298–325, 1999.
[23] N.V. Krylov. Parabolic equations with VMO coefficients in sobolev spaces with mixed norms. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 250(2):521 – 558, 2007.
[24] Alois Kufner. *Weighted Sobolev spaces*. A Wiley-Interscience Publication. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, 1985. Translated from the Czech.
[25] Nikolai Nadirashvili. Nonuniqueness in the martingale problem and the Dirichlet problem for uniformly elliptic operators. *Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci. (4)*, 24(3):537–549, 1997.
[26] N. N. Ural′ceva. The impossibility of ${W_q}^2$ estimates for multidimensional elliptic equations with discontinuous coefficients. *Zap. Naučn. Sem. Leningrad. Otdel. Mat. Inst. Steklov. (LOMI)*, 5:250–254, 1967.

(H. Dong) Division of Applied Mathematics, Brown University, 182 George Street, Providence, RI 02912, USA
E-mail address: Hongjie_Dong@brown.edu

(D. Kim) Department of Applied Mathematics, Kyung Hee University, 1732 Deogyeong-daero, Giheung-gu, Yongin-si, Gyeonggi-do 446-701, Republic of Korea
E-mail address: doyoonkim@khu.ac.kr

(H. Zhang) Division of Applied Mathematics, Brown University, 182 George Street, Providence, RI 02912, USA
E-mail address: Hong_Zhang@brown.edu